	Case 4:06-cv-07339-CW	Document 107	Filed 05/	29/2008	Page 1 of 4	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Daniel Feinberg – CA State Bar No. Todd F. Jackson – CA State Bar No. Margaret E. Hasselman – CA State In No. Kirsten Gibney Scott – CA State Bar No. Kirsten Gibney Scott – CA State Bar LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAK 1330 Broadway, Suite 1800 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 839-6824 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839 Email: dfeinberg@lewisfeinberg.com Email: tjackson@lewisfeinberg.com Email: mhasselman@lewisfeinberg.com Email: nwasow@lewisfeinberg.com Email: kscott@lewisfeinberg.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Prop (Additional counsel listed within)	. 202598 Bar No. 228529 242047 r No. 253464 KER & JACKSON, m	P.C.			
11 12 13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO AND OAKLAND DIVISION THOMAS FERNANDEZ, LORA SMITH, and ) Case No. C-06-07339 CW					
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li><li>17</li></ul>	TOSHA THOMAS, individually and of a class of all other persons similar Plaintiffs,  vs.	rly situated, )	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND APPOINTMENT AS CLASS COUNSEL			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO K-M INDUSTRIES HOLDING CO ESOP PLAN COMMITTEE; WILL AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVO TRUST; TRUSTEES OF THE WILL AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVO TRUST; CIG ESOP PLAN COMMINORTH STAR TRUST COMPANY DESIREE B. MOORE REVOCABI WILLIAM E. MOORE MARITAL WILLIAM E. MOORE GENERATI SKIPPING TRUST; and DESIREE BOTH IN HER INDIVIDUAL CAP AND AS TRUSTEE OF THE WILL AND DESIREE B. MOORE REVO TRUST'S SUCCESSOR TRUSTS IN ABOVE,  Defendants.	., INC.; ) ., INC. ) ., INC. ) .IAM E. ) .CABLE ) .LIAM E. ) Da .CABLE ) Til .TTEE; ) Co .Y; ) Juo .LE TRUST; ) .TRUST; ) .TRUST; ) .MOORE, ) .PACITY ) .LIAM E. ) .CABLE )	ate: me: ourtroom: dge:	July 3, 200 2 p.m. 2, 4th Floo Hon. Clau		
28	[Proposed] Order Granting Mot [Case No. C-06-07339 CW]	TION FOR CLASS CE	RTIFICATIO	N	Page 1	

2 3 4

1

5 6

7 8

10

11

9

12 13

15

14

17

16

18 19

20

21

22

24

23

25 26

27 28

Having considered the parties' written and oral submissions regarding Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification, the Court finds and determines pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 that Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification should be granted. Accordingly, this Court certifies a nationwide Class. The Court finds that:

- 1. The class of over 2,500 class members is so numerous as to make it impracticable to join all members. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(a)(1) are met.
- 2. There are common questions of law and fact with respect to the Class Members' claims for violation of ERISA Section 502 and ERISA Section 406. The common questions of law and fact include: a) whether K-M Defendants and the Moore Trust Defendants engaged in prohibited transactions under ERISA by permitting the ESOP to purchase Series P and Series I stock for more than fair market value; b) whether K-M Defendants engaged in a prudent investigation of the proposed sale of Series P and Series I stock by the Moore Trust to the ESOP; c) whether K-M Defendants breached a fiduciary duty to Plan participants by causing the ESOP to purchase Series I and Series P stock from the Moore Trust for more than fair market value; d) whether K-M Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Plan participants by failing to obtain adequate valuations of Series I and Series P stock in each year; e) whether K-M Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Plan participants by failing to recoup overpayments by the Plan for Series I and Series P stock; f) whether North Star, as successor trustee, failed to take reasonable steps to remedy fiduciary violations committed by prior fiduciaries; g) whether the ESOP suffered losses resulting from such breaches; and h) whether Defendants must make the ESOP whole for such losses. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(a)(2) are met.
- 3. The claims of Plaintiffs Thomas Fernandez, Lora Smith, and Tosha Thomas are typical of the claims of the Class Members because they assert the same claims as the Class and their claims arise from the same operative facts. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(a)(3) are met.
- 4. Plaintiffs Thomas Fernandez, Lora Smith, and Tosha Thomas will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class as class representatives. The named Plaintiffs are

6

8

10

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

represented by counsel experienced and qualified to conduct the pending litigation and the interests of the named Plaintiffs are not antagonistic to those of the Class. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(a)(4) are met.

- 5. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class would impair others from protecting their interests because an action seeking to remedy an ERISA breach of fiduciary duty is brought in a representative capacity on behalf of the plan as a whole. The Court's adjudication of the issues in this case will, as a practical matter, dispose of the Class members' claims. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(b)(1)(B) are met.
- 6. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class would create a risk of inconsistent adjudications with incompatible standards because the core claims affect the whole plan and all plan participants in the same manner. Different outcomes in multiple cases would make it nearly impossible for Defendants to comply. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(b)(1)(A) are met.
- 7. Defendants' conduct at issue in this case generally applies to the whole Class, making injunctive and declaratory relief appropriate. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief. Thus, the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2) are met.
- 8. Plaintiffs' counsel are knowledgeable about and have extensive experience in the applicable area of the law, and have committed adequate resources to representing the class. Thus, Plaintiffs' counsel has satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(g).

In light of the foregoing and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(1) and (b)(2), Plaintiffs' claims for violation of ERISA Section 502 and ERISA Section 406 are certified on an opt-out basis.
- 2. The Class is defined as all persons who were participants in the ESOP on October 13, 1998, or at any time thereafter, and/or beneficiaries of ESOP participants on October 13,

Ī	Case 4:06-cv-07339-CW Document 107 Filed 05/29/2008 Page 4 of 4						
1	1998, or any time thereafter.						
2	3. Plaintiffs Thomas Fernandez, Lora Smith, and Tosha Thomas are appointed class						
3	representatives of the Class. The law firms of Lewis, Feinberg, Lee, Renaker & Jackson, P.C.,						
4	and Rukin Hyland Doria & Tindall LLP are appointed as Class Counsel.						
5							
6	Dated: Hon. Claudia Wilken						
7	United States District Judge, Northern District of California						
8	Northern District of Camornia						
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>							
28							
20	[Proposed] Order Granting Motion for Class Certification						
	[CASE No. C-06-07339 CW ] Page 4						